

# **Summary**

## **NPS Winter Use Roving Team Meeting with Wyoming**

**Date:** 11/02/05

**Location:** Herschler Building, Cheyenne, Wyoming

**Present:** Scott Covinton, Nicholas Dewar, Jay Jerde, John Keck, Ryan Lance, Gary Pollock, Tim Puskarich, John Sacklin, Vern Stelter, Temple Stevenson, Denice Swanke, David Troyanek, Mike Yochim

### **1. Purpose agency/group or NPS gave for wanting a visit at this time:**

To have a relatively un-orchestrated opportunity for dialogue about the Winter Use Plan

### **2. Results of this meeting and/or next steps:**

#### **2.1. Next steps in EIS process**

- 2.1.1. NPS expects to receive the scoping report from their consultant on November 15. This report may necessitate some changes to the Scenarios that have been developed.
- 2.1.2. NPS intends to publish a newsletter with the Scenarios (amended as necessary) in late November or early December.
- 2.1.3. The NPS has a couple more weeks during which it can receive and consider particular ideas that are not represented in the current range of Scenarios, and invites contributions of this sort from Wyoming.

#### **2.2. Other**

- 2.2.1. NPS (Mike Yochim) will send Temple Stevenson the list of data that NPS hopes to receive from Cooperating Agencies (CAs).
- 2.2.2. NPS and Wyoming reached agreement on amendments to the MOU that Wyoming had proposed. Denice Swanke will incorporate these changes in the latest draft. This will be reviewed by NPS counsel before being distributed once again to the CAs for a final brief comment period.
- 2.2.3. NPS (Denice Swanke) will provide Wyoming with copies of the substantive comment letters that they received during the scoping period. They will not send the letters that they have identified as “form letters” and they will send only the letters that they have selected as representative of the range of issues raised. They expect that there will be less than 100 letters in this sample. This item will be completed once the NPS receives the scoping report from North Wind.

### **3. Points raised:**

- 3.1. Wyoming asked what criteria NPS will model for, and requested that NPS provide a list. NPS explained that modeling for air quality, sound-scape, and economic issues will be performed, and that analyses will be carried out for wildlife, social, personnel exposure, snow-pack, safety, and operational issues.
- 3.2. Wyoming would like an opportunity to meet with other Cooperating Agencies (CAs) to discuss the Alternatives prior to the consideration by the CAs of the “Internal Review” version of the DEIS. NPS is not sure that the schedule for completing the EIS will allow the addition of this step. NPS will consider how this can be scheduled. NPS noted that they are considering publishing a newsletter outlining an early draft of the Alternatives.

#### **4. Questions asked:**

- 4.1. How was the 105 Snow Coach limit developed (Scenario B)?
- 4.2. Has the NPS determined a carrying capacity for Yellowstone?
- 4.3. Why does Scenario C allow for over-snow access from the South entrance?
- 4.4. Why has a scenario been developed (Scenario F) on the basis of the two most recent years? Aren't these anomalous because of poor snow conditions and uncertainty about access by snowmobiles?
- 4.5. Is NPS informing the public about snowmobile access to the Parks? Is NPS publicizing this by attending snowmobile conventions etc?
- 4.6. Is NPS expecting to receive comments from people who visited the park last winter, or from others?
- 4.7. What are the rationales for the proportions of guided and unguided snowmobiles?
- 4.8. Why is there no seasonal allowance for Grand Teton in Scenario H? In particular, why is there no seasonal allowance for Jackson Lake? In fact, why use limits on Jackson Lake at all?
- 4.9. What controls are proposed for snowplanes in the scenarios?
- 4.10. Where in the scenarios is there reference to air quality standards? Can management procedures mitigate air quality problems (especially at entrances)?
- 4.11. How is modeling used in the development of alternatives?
- 4.12. Has NPS used economic models to determine what visitation volume is needed to sustain the Lodges?
- 4.13. Why isn't the plowing of the NE Entrance - Mammoth road specified in Scenario I?